

**Agenda**  
**Architectural Review Board**  
**August 28, 2006 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Mayor's Pre-Council Chamber – Government Plaza**  
**205 Government Street**

- A. Call to order – Chair**
- B. Approval of Minutes**
- C. Approval of Mid-Month Permits by Staff**

- 1. Applicant's Name:** Kevin Cross  
**Property Address:** 1567 Luling Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 1, 2006

THIS COA REPLACES COA DATED 11/10/04.  
Remove existing deteriorated concrete block garage. Construct MHDC stock garage as per submitted plans. Paint to match main residence.

- 2. Applicant's Name:** C and H Company, LLC  
**Property Address:** 1112 Palmetto  
**Date of Approval:** August 1, 2006

Remove old shed. Construct new 12 x 16 shed per standard MHDC plans. Construct using Hardi plank lap siding. Windows and doors to be wood. Install shingle roof and paint to match house. Repair existing privacy fence to match existing.

- 3. Applicant's Name:** Mack Lewis/Ellen Harvey  
**Property Address:** 120 Ryan Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** August 4, 2006

Paint exterior in the following Devoe colors: body-Ivory Tan; trim-white; shutters-French Quarter Green.

- 4. Applicant's Name:** Lipford Construction/ Hutchison  
**Property Address:** 109 Levert  
**Date of Approval:** August 9, 2006

Paint exterior in the following colors:  
Body and trim-white;  
Shutters and foundation-Benjamin Moore, Black Forest Green;  
Porch ceiling-Sirrus Wisper, Devoe.

- 5. Applicant's Name:** Ernie Home Repair/John Lawler  
**Property Address:** 103 Ryan Avenue

**Date of Approval:** August 14, 2006

Install new roof with materials matching existing in profile, material, color and dimension.

6. **Applicant's Name:** Richmar Construction/Matt Sellers  
**Property Address:** 1209 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 7, 2006

Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; add soffit vents, cap fireplaces; seal openings in soffit; prime new materials in preparation to paint.

7. **Applicant's Name:** John Hamilton  
**Property Address:** 1014 Caroline Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** August 10, 2006

(This COA replaces COA dated 5-2-05) Repair rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension; Paint in the following colors: Body: pale yellow; trim-white; porch deck: dark green.

8. **Applicant's Name:** Kevin Cross  
**Property Address:** 1567 Luling Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 1, 2006

THIS COA REPLACES COA DATED 11/10/04.

Remove existing deteriorated concrete block garage. Construct MHDC stock garage as per submitted plans. Paint to match main residence.

9. **Applicant's Name:** Bay Flowers/Wrico Signs  
**Property Address:** 452 A Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 9, 2006

Install single faced non-illuminated metal sign that is 15 sq. ft. per the submitted design.

10. **Applicant's Name:** Jennifer Freeman & Emily Oberkirch  
**Property Address:** 1714 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** July 31, 2006

Install oval sign made out of wood (resin approximating wood) measuring 27" x 54". Sign to be single faced, hung from chains and be black with green lettering per the submitted sign design.

11. **Applicant's Name:** Barbara G. Giddens  
**Property Address:** 200 South Dearborn  
**Date of Approval:** August 1, 2006

Repair foundation infill to be as follows: Black plywood placed behind current Somerville red lattice panels between brick piers.

12. **Applicant's Name:** Paul Shestak  
**Property Address:** 201 South Warren St.  
**Date of Approval:** August 2, 2006

Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint building in existing color scheme. Unpainted brick to remain unpainted.

13. **Applicant's Name:** Connie Robinson/Nextel  
**Property Address:** 205 Dauphin St.  
**Date of Approval:** August 3, 2006

Install 4ft. x 2 ft. double faced painted wood sign per the submitted design. Sign to be hung from chains under balcony.

14. **Applicant's Name:** Greg Murphy Contracting, Inc.  
**Property Address:** 307 Conti Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 7, 2006

Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint building in existing color scheme.

15. **Applicant's Name:** Betty A. Johnson  
**Property Address:** 307 George Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 14, 2006

Repair flooring and siding on back porch with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Remove screen on back porch. Repaint house in the following color scheme:

Body: (color sample submitted) Marvin Window, hurricane color.  
Trim: Lauren Ashley #717 Twine.

16. **Applicant's Name:** Victor Castro  
**Property Address:** 162 Michigan Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** August 7, 2006

Lay concrete patio in rear yard 13 ft. round area with 10' x 3' extension per the submitted site plan. Install 16 ft. x 6ft. deck 2 ft. above grade. Install handrail and steps per MHDC drawing.

17. **Applicant's Name:** Briley Shirah  
**Property Address:** 915 Palmetto Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 9, 2006

Replace unapproved wood fence along Palmetto Street with a 6 ft. stucco covered wall with a 4 in. concrete cap per drawing on file in MHDC office. Stucco to have sand finish.

- 18. Applicant's Name: Will Hester**  
**Property Address: 955 Augusta Street**  
**Date of Approval: August 9, 2006**

Paint exterior in the following Devoe colors:  
body-Odessa Pink;  
trim-white;  
shutters and porch deck-Cinder Block (green).

**D. NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS:**

No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

**E. OLD BUSINESS:**

- 1. 078-05/06-CA** 1659 Government Street  
Applicant: Messina & Harris, Inc./T-Mobile  
Nature of Request: Install 70 ft. monopole; install wood fence and landscaping.

**F. NEW BUSINESS:**

- 1. 082-05/06-CA** 109 Ryan Avenue  
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Thomas M. Leland/Pete J. Vallas  
Nature of Request: Remodel existing rear building to a 2 story guest house;  
Alter front porch on main house by covering terraces to create two additional porch bays.
- 2. 083-05/06-CA** 1749 Hunter Avenue  
Applicant: Elise Partridge  
Nature of Request: Construct 6 ft. fence with two feet of lattice on west property line; add 2 ft. of lattice to remainder of fencing on site.
- 3. 084-05/06-CA** 206 S. Cedar Street  
Applicant: George K. Noland, Jr.  
Nature of Request: Rebuild rear deck, retain roof over deck constructed without ARB approval and screen covered deck.
- 4. 085-05/06-CA** 954 Government Street  
Applicant: Dash Neighborhood Revitalization/Wrico Signs, Inc.  
Nature of Request: Install signs totaling 64 sq. ft.

- |           |  |   |
|-----------|--|---|
| <b>5.</b> | <b>086-05/06-CA</b><br>Applicant:<br><br>Nature of Request | 51 S. Conception Street<br>Tim Burt/Michael Hallisey of Cohen Carnaggio and<br>Reynolds<br>Renovations and additions to an existing masonry<br>structure. |
| <b>6.</b> | <b>087-05/06-CA</b><br>Applicant:<br>Nature of Request     | 155 Marine Street<br>Tuan Titlestaad/Bay Town Builders<br>Renovate existing house per submitted plans.  |

**G. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF COMMENTS**

**078-05/05-CA – CA**    1659 Government Street  
**Applicant:**            David Wilkins for Messina & Harris, Inc.  
**Received:**              7/24/06                      **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    9/7/06                      1) 8/14/06            2)8/28/06            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Leinkauf Historic District  
**Classification:**        Non-contributing  
**Zoning:**                    B-1, Buffer Business  
**Additional Permits Required:** (1) Fence; (2) Tree  
**Nature of Project:**      Install 70 ft. light pole to be used for parking lot lighting and stealth antenna.  
                                  Install wood fence and landscaping as required by Landscape Ordinance.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts*

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
3	Fences, Walls & Gates	Install wood fence

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:… Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…”

**STAFF REPORT**

The current Design Review Guidelines do not directly address structures such as cell towers, satellite dishes, antennas, etc. However, Section 9 under Standard of Review addresses the appropriateness and the impact of elements within the context of historic districts. Facts are enumerated for the Board’s consideration of this request.

The application was tabled at the last meeting. A balloon was floated on August 18, 2006. The balloon was not visible from Government Street. The balloon was visible from the west side of Monterey Street approximately half way between Lamar and Government Streets. It was visible on Park Terrace approximately half way between Lamar and Government Streets. While S. Monterey is within the Leinkauf Historic District, Park Terrace is not included within a historic district.

1. The tower will be located on the south side of Government Street between Park Terrace and S. Monterey Streets in the rear corner of an existing parking lot that has numerous trees.
2. The parking lot is on the edge of the Leinkauf Historic District and faces the north side of Government Street which is located in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
3. Plans call for the placement of equipment at the base of the tower.
4. The equipment will be masked by a 6 ft. privacy fence and a 2 ft. buffer of eleven 7 gal viburnum 4' high planted 4 ft. on center.
5. The tower is 70' tall, with the new T-Mobile antenna located at 65 ft.
6. The application notes that the tower will provide additional illumination for the parking lot, however, the plans show no provision for parking lot lighting.
7. Typically, towers of this nature have up to 2 co-locations for cell phone use, requiring additional buildings to house equipment.
8. As required, the applicant has submitted information to the Alabama Historical Commission for Section 106 Review to mitigate any negative impact on the Leinkauf or Old Dauphin Way Historic Districts. The AHC has found that there would be a negative impact on the surrounding historic districts
9. One water oak will be removed from the site; two will remain.
10. The tower will be higher than the existing canopy of live oaks.

Staff considered that the T-Mobile Stealth pole and antennae would have a minimal negative impact on the Leinkauf Historic District. However, staff believes the addition of a light will draw attention to the pole and should be discouraged or at least placed low enough on the tower to keep light spillage from the neighboring houses.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF COMMENTS**

**082-05/06-CA**                    109 Ryan Avenue  
**Applicant:**                    Mr. and Mrs. Thomas M. Leland/Pete J. Vallas, architect  
**Received:**                      8/11/06                              **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days:    9/25/06                              1) 8/28/06  
**Additional Permits Required:**  
**Nature of Project:**            Alter the rear original garage to convert it into a guest house. Expand the front porch of the house.

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**              Ashland PlaceHistoric District  
**Classification:**                Contributing  
**Zoning:**                          R-1, Single family residential  
**Additional Permits Required:**

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:...Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work on the garage complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district. The proposed work to expand the front porch will impair the historic integrity of the building and should be denied.

**Garage/Guest house**

1. 109 Ryan is a two story frame residence constructed in the Classic Revival style.
2. The proposed additions and alterations to the garage will be visible from the street, although the building is located in the far rear corner of the lot.
3. A two story classically detailed porch will be created on the south side of the building.
4. On the east elevation, the double metal entrance door will be removed and wood siding and a pair of French doors installed.
5. A small window on the north side will be removed and infilled with wood siding.
6. All windows will be wood and the historic windows reused where possible.
7. All materials and architectural details will match the existing historic house.
8. The garage is an early, probably original, element of the property and is one of the defining characteristics of the neighborhood and the house.



Staff recognizes that changes to the lifestyle of property owners often reflect a need for alterations of historic structures. However, these changes should respect the original envelope of the building in a way that does not alter the character of the structure or the complex. The change in use of this building from an original garage to a guest house, creates a false sense of history that is echoed in the physical changes. Balancing the needs of the owners with the requirements of the ordinance, staff recommends approval of the proposed work on the guest house with the following two changes: the design of the east end be reconfigured to retain the appearance/suggestion of the garage entry; and the original window on the north side be retained (this may necessitate a slight rearrangement of interior space).

**Expansion of the front porch on the main house.**

1. Porches are a character-defining element of a building within Mobile's historic districts.
2. The house has an uneven 3 bay front porch with round classical columns and wood deck balustrade.
3. The porch is a character defining element of the house and is part of the individuality of styles and elements used in the upscale Ashland subdivision.
3. The horizontality of the porch will be increased by adding a bay to each end.
4. Original window and door openings should be retained.
5. Double 9/1 wood windows are located to either side of the entrance portico.
6. It is proposed to include these paired windows under the extended porch.
7. These two windows will be increased in size in order to provide access to the newly created porch bays.

The facades of buildings are the most public part of the house and are often the area the original owners considered design to be of utmost importance. It is the façade that generally most represents the original character of the house. Therefore staff believes the alteration of the front would significantly impair the historic character of the house and recommends denial of these alterations to the main façade of the house.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF REPORT**

**084-05/06-CA**            1749 Hunter Avenue  
**Applicant:**            Elise Partridge  
**Received:**            8/4/06                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/18/06                            1) 8/28/06    2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Nature of Project:**     Construct 8 ft. privacy fence consisting of 6 ft. of board fencing with 2 ft. of lattice above; add 2 ft lattice to existing portions of board fence

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines For Mobile's Historic Districts*

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change: ... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...

**STAFF REPORT**

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences "...should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic Districts.”
  - 1. The subject structure is a 20<sup>th</sup> century Bungalow.
  - 2. The subject structure is a contributing element within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
  - 3. The subject lot measures approximately 60 ft x 150 ft.
  - 4. The proposed wood fence will be 8 ft. high and be a 6 ft. board fence with 2 feet of lattice above.
  - 5. The proposed fence will encircle the rear yard and be set back from the sidewalk a distance greater than 25 ft.
  - 6. The proposed fence will be left natural to weather.
  - 7. Design Guidelines state that privacy fences are generally restricted to 6 ft. in height.
  - 8. Adjacent properties are residential rather than commercial.

Staff knows of no reason that would cause an exception to the six foot rule to be considered. The neighboring fences appear to be at the standard 6 foot height and this change would create a fence

out of scale and design with the neighborhood. Therefore staff believes the addition of the two feet of lattice would impair the historic integrity of neighborhood and recommends denial of a fence that exceed 6 ft. in height.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF COMMENTS**

**085-05/06-CA**            206 S. Cedar Street  
**Applicant:**            George K. Noland, Jr.  
**Received:**            8/14/06                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 9/28/06                            1) 8/28/06    2)        3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Church Street East Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Nature of Project:**      Rebuild existing rear deck, roof over deck and screen enclose as per submitted plans.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The building is a c. 1890 Victorian shotgun with an offset rear addition.
2. The lot measures 43’ x 103’.
3. There is an existing rear deck approximately 12’ x 24’ that is 22 ft. from the rear property line and in line with the existing house.
4. The deck is not visible from the street, but is visible from the yards of adjacent properties.
5. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance allows additions to structures in historic districts to be able to maintain lines established by the historic structures.
6. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance allows the site coverage to increase from 35% to 50%.
7. The roof is a shed addition supported by square posts.
8. if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted providing the concrete block foundation is stuccoed, columns are detailed with capitals and bases and a screening plan is submitted to staff and more appropriate stairs are constructed.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF COMMENTS**

**086-05/06-CA**            954 Government Street  
**Applicant:**            Dash Neighborhood Revitalization/Wrico Signs, Inc.  
**Received:**            8/14/06                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/28/06                            1) 8/28/06    2)        3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**    Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**    Non-contributing  
**Zoning:**            Buffer Business  
Nature of Project:    Install pole sign in front and 2 small signs at rear of building.

**STAFF REPORT**

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and the Government Street Corridor*

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change: ... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the items requested will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district. One item will impair the integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The one story masonry structure is a non-contributing structure within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
2. The property is under review for signage by the Architectural Review Board because of its location within the Historic District and also its location within the Government Street Sign Corridor.
3. Three signs were submitted by the sign contractor.
4. Of the three, two meet the guidelines and one did not.
5. The first design is a 50 sq. ft. pole sign to be placed in the front yard.
6. The second sign is a 2 sq. ft. sign to be placed on the back door.
7. The third design is 12 sq. ft. to hang from an existing standard at the rear of the building in the parking lot.
8. All signs are painted metal and will be non-illuminated.
9. The sign guidelines restrict pole signs to a maximum of 40 sq. ft.

Staff recommends approval of the signs conditioned on the front pole sign being reduced to a maximum of 40 sq. ft. as allowed under the Sign Guidelines.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF COMMENTS**

**086-05/06 – CA**            51 S. Conception Street  
**Applicant:**                Tim Burt/Michael Hallisey of Cohen Carnaggio and Reynolds  
**Received:**                8/15/06                                **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days:    9/15/06                                1) 8/28/06    2)                                3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Not located in a historic district, but adjacent to LDSCD and CSE  
**Classification:**         Non-contributing  
**Zoning:**                    B-4, General Business  
**Additional Permits Required:**     Right of Way; Traffic Engineering; Urban Development; Urban Forestry  
**Nature of the Project:** Convert the abandoned building, previously used as a night club, to a multi-use structure with a first story retail and two second story apartments. Create a parking area for the facility on the south and east sides. This is an unusual request since the property is not in the historic district. The owners have asked the ARB to review the project in order to make suggestions that would ensure the design meets with the surrounding historic districts.

**STAFF REPORT**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change: ... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guidelines* and the *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines*.

**Part 1 – Convert Building into Commercial Space with 2 Apartments**

The Design Review Guidelines state that “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.

1. Early photographs indicate that the building was rectangular with a triple arch on Conti Street and single arch on St. Emanuel. Current plans call for the reinstatement of this arrangement with a recessed diagonal entrance.
2. Early photographs show that the arches continued down St. Emanuel Street and that they had been enclosed or partially enclosed fairly early. Plans call for the installation of a modern storefront with a three bay balcony. The doorway that leads to the upstairs remains in place and a new arched opening leads into a terrace on the south side.
3. The south side plans indicates a supporting post with iron dividers to create a semi-open terrace. The original second story windows on the overhang are to be retained.

4. Also on the Conti plan is an arched storefront window and separate double door entrance reminiscent of the early photograph. A dumpster shelter will be built to the east with double doors.
5. The east elevation indicates a change in window and door openings. Two windows are being shortened and a third is being infilled and covered with a mortar wash.
6. The second floor around the building retains its current configuration with several exceptions. A small balcony will cover the dumpster area and a door will be installed to access it. Two long windows will be installed on the St. Emanuel side to access the balcony. A new stucco wash will cover the existing second story section on the south side and the dormer and eaves will be repaired.

The current yellow brick is a veneer applied to the building at some time probably after WWII. There is evidence of the original brickwork with relieving arches visible beneath the veneer. Though the windows are modern, staff would like to see the original brick uncovered and exposed, if practical. Otherwise, the staff recommends the application as submitted.

**B. PARKING PLAN** – The plan calls for general parking in the surrounding lot.

1. There are 12 proposed spaces with one handicap space.
2. A 4 foot 12” CMU wall will be placed on St. Emanuel Street at the southern corner of the property. It will have mortar wash finish.
3. There is no design for the wall submitted.
4. This wall will be repeated on Conti Street on either side of curb cut.
5. Two trees, dimensions not given, with landscape are proposed for the site.
6. Plant strip with hedge is shown on the south and east property lines; no details given.

Often staff would recommend that parking have walls with a planting bed between the wall and the property line. However, since this building is located on the property line, the use of greenery along the sidewalk in the urban setting would not be appropriate. The planting strip along the property lines is a help to softening the effect of the parking area. However, with the overall greening of Mobile, particularly in the historic districts, two trees do not seem sufficient for such a large property. This may also be an issue with Urban Forestry and the owners should clear their plans with that department. The owners are encouraged to find more opportunities for overstory plantings.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF COMMENTS**

**087-05/06 – CA**            155 Marine Street  
**Applicant:**            Tuan Titlestaad/Douglas Kearley, architect  
**Received:**            8/14/06                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days:    9/28/06                            1) 8/28/06            2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**    Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**    Contributing  
**Zoning:**            R-1, Single family residential  
**Nature of the Project:** Renovate existing building per the submitted plans. Recent rear addition to be rebuilt to match existing; install new section of privacy fence and repair existing portions of fencing.

**STAFF REPORT**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:… Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guideline*.

1. The one story frame residential structure dates from 1892.
2. Only a few turned posts remain on the front porch and the railing is missing.
3. Dormer to be installed on south side and a skylight to be installed on the north slope of the roof.
4. Chain link fence to be removed and a wood privacy fence to be installed on north side.
5. Existing wood fencing to be repaired.
6. New Victorian details to be added per existing photographs.
7. Porch to be added on rear elevation.
8. Paint colors to be submitted at a later date.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.



**Addendum to Agenda  
Architectural Review Board  
August 28, 2006 – 3:00 P.M.  
Mayor’s Pre-Council Chamber – Government Plaza  
205 Government Street**

**New Business continued:**

- |           |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|
| <b>7.</b> | <b>088-05/06-CA</b><br>Applicant:<br>Nature of Request: | 1751-1759 Old Shell Road<br>Cornell Family Properties<br>Request to install parking behind 1757 and 1759 Old Shell Road   |
| <b>8.</b> | <b>089-05/06-CA</b><br>Applicant:<br>Nature of Request: | 308 St. Louis Street<br>Renaissance Development Company, LLC/ John Dendy, architect<br>Development of Mobile Fixture warehouse building into 21 residential condominiums with indoor parking garage |

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF COMMENTS**

**089-05/06 – CA**            308 St. Louis Street  
**Applicant:**                Renaissance Development Company, LLC/ John Dendy & Associates, Architects  
**Received:**                 8/10/06                                **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days:    9/24/06                                1) 8/28/06                                2)                                3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        DeTonti Square Historic District  
**Classification:**        Noncontributing  
**Zoning:**                    B-4  
**Nature of the Project:** Renovate buildings on the block into 21 residential condominiums. Also create indoor parking. Only a single lot is in the historic district, but following precedent set by other projects, the entire project will be reviewed by the ARB.

**STAFF REPORT**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:… Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guidelines*. This project respects the individual character of each building unit and concentrates on revealing their matter of fact industrial features.

1. Six separate buildings on the block will be combined in this project.
2. The existing massing of all buildings will be retained.
3. Many sealed window and door openings on all elevations will be reinstated as part of the project.
4. Bldg A, the former Mobile fixture building, will retain its window openings on the second floor on both the north and west elevations.
5. Bldg A will retain 3 bay first floor openings with the upper panel demolished and new glass and door infill .
6. Bldg A openings will be reinstated on the west elevation and new windows will be installed with awnings placed over the windows.
7. A garage door will be installed on the west elevation.
8. New roof with new cap and flashing to be installed on all buildings as well as gutters and downspouts.
9. All masonry walls to be repaired to match existing.
10. All existing windows to be repaired and reglazed.
11. Install iron fence on east elevation.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF COMMENTS**

**088-05/06 – CA**                    1751, 1757 and 1759 Old Shell Road  
Applicant:                        Cornell Family Properties/Arthur Smith  
Received:                         8/9/06                                    Meeting Date (s):  
 Submission Date + 45 Days:        9/23/06                                 1) 8/28/06        2)                                        3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**                Non-contributing and two contributing  
**Zoning:**                            B-2, Neighborhood Business  
**Nature of the Project:** Install parking for commercial building at 1751 and behind residences at 1757 and 1759 Old Shell Road. Demolish existing garage apartment and existing carport. Install landscaping per the submitted plan.

**STAFF REPORT**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:… Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guideline*.

1. The site consists of one commercial structure and two residential structures.
2. The two residential buildings contribute to the historic character of the district.
3. The commercial building is considered a non-contributing building in the district..
4. The two contributing buildings are one-story frame, vernacular structures, ca. 1919.
5. There are currently 28 parking spaces for 1751 OSR.
6. The additional parking will bring the total to 48 spaces.
7. The proposed landscaping will be 9058 sq. ft. with 4967 being the required amount.
8. An application has been made to the Planning Commission for resubdivision.
9. The application includes a request to rezone 1757 & 1759 to R-1.
10. The tree ordinance must be met on the new section of lot 1.
11. The tree calculation and tree plan appear to be incorrect.
12. The site plan for a 6’ fence is shown on the plan.
13. The site is adjacent to primarily residential areas.
14. There is no fence design in the application
15. There is no photograph or description of the two buildings to be demolished.
16. The lighting plan is to be submitted.
17. The material of the parking lot is not identified.

The Board can consider only the request and not the use of the property. Currently application has been made to the Planning Commission for resubdivision and rezoning, but it has not been scheduled. If the

ARB approves the present request, it must be contingent upon review by the Planning Commission. However, at this stage it appears the application is not complete: pictures of buildings to be demolished; materials; landscaping; fencing and lighting. Staff is attempting to get these materials in time for the meeting. If the information can not be obtained, staff recommends denial due to lack of information and that the applicant resubmits with a complete package. Staff also recommends the Board consider internal landscaping in the back parking lot, and that the fence be constructed with the finished side to the neighbors and have a cap.